

LUC-430/Mutha 1

16

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**Rejection Under Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny**

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 and 19-25 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Number 6,324,582 Issued to Sridhar on November 27, 2001 and U. S. Patent Application Number 2002/0075304 issued to Thompson dated June 20, 2002, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Number 2003/0065743 issued to Jenny dated April 3, 2003.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"one or more server components operable to communicate with one or more router components, wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, and wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of:

a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more user communication devices;

an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more user communication devices;

an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more user communication devices; and

a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more user communication devices;

wherein the one or more server components are operable to assign an internet protocol address to the one or more user communication devices, and wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises a biological or an atomic data storage medium, and wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ at least one of the one or more identifiers

LUC-430/Mutha 1

17

and one or more screening preferences to direct a voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) call as one of one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more user communication devices."

Sridhar does not teach or suggest these limitations. This is because the Examiner alleges that Sridhar discloses "the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more routers to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses ... ". See the rejection of claim 1. By contrast, applicant's claim 1 recites "the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses ... ". As known by those skilled in the art, user communication devices include a personal computer, an internet telephone, a landline telephone and a mobile communication device. Since a router is not a personal computer, an internet telephone, a landline telephone or a mobile communication device, it cannot be considered a user communication device. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Sridhar.

Second, Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny do not teach or suggest server components that comprise a biological or an atomic data storage medium. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny individually and in combination.

Third, the Final Office Action has cited Jenny only for its alleged teaching of "an optical drive". Also, the Final Office Action has cited Thompson only for its teaching of "phone number, email address, an instant message and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices" identifier. Thus, the Final Office Action seems to indicate, and applicant agrees, that Jenny and Thompson do not supply the elements of applicant's claim 1 that were shown hereinabove not to be taught by Sridhar.

Therefore the proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicant's claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 2-14 and 22-29 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Independent claims 15, 21 and 30 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which, as shown above, is not taught by the proposed combination

LUC-430/Mutha 1

18

of Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny. For example, claims 15 and 21 recite, "searching one or more databases with one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more Internet protocol addresses ..." and "the one or more server components comprises a biological or an atomic data storage medium", and claim 30 recites "wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more Internet protocol addresses". The proposed combination of Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny does not teach or suggest these limitations for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claims 15, 21 and 30 are likewise allowable over the proposed combination. Since claims 16-20 depend from claim 15, these dependent claims are also allowable over the proposed combination.

Rejections Under Sridhar, Thompson, Jenny, Conrath, Brooks, Levine and Maes

Claims 3-4 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny as applied to claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15 and 19-21 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,103,770 issued to Conrath on September 5, 2006.

Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Gonzales, Higgins and Conrath as applied to claims 1-11, 14-17 and 19-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 7,047,305 issued to Brooks on May 16, 2006.

Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson and Jenny, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Number 2004/0258220 issued to Levine dated December 23, 2004.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Jenny, Conrath, and Brooks as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-21, and further in view of U. S. Patent Number 6,801,604 issued to Maes on October 5, 2004.

Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection.

These rejections are based on the rejection under Sridhar, Thompson, and Jenny being proper. As that ground of rejection has been overcome, and none of the cited

LUC-430/Mutha 1

19

references teach or suggest "wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses" or "the one or more server components comprises a biological or an atomic data storage medium", as recited in applicant's independent claims 1 and 30, and "searching one or more databases with one or more identifiers of one or more user communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses ... " and "the one or more server components comprises a biological or an atomic data storage medium", as recited in applicant's independent claims 15 and 21, the combination of Sridhar, Thompson, Jenny, Conrath, Maes and Brooks does not supply these missing elements. Thus, these combinations do not make obvious any of applicant's claims, all of which require the aforesaid limitations.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
LUC-430/Mutha 1
NOV 17 2010


20

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


James Milton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: November 17, 2010

CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC
Customer Number 47382
(312) 346-2800